DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 737 UD 007 413

Project for the Inservice Preparation of Teachers for the Desegregation of Selected School Faculties Through the Implementation of Team Teaching. Technical Progress Report, April 1, 1967 through June 30, 1967.

Chattanooga Public Schools, Tenn.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 67
Grant-OEG-36-52-E031
Note-54p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
Descriptors-Conferences, Information Dissemination, *Inservice Programs, *Integration Methods, Principals, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, *Teacher Integration, *Team Teaching
Identifiers-Chattanooga Public Schools, Tennessee

The 1967 project for staff desegregation through interracial team teaching, conducted in 16 schools in Chattanooga, Tenn., used three methods of inservice training: workshops for teachers and principals before the opening of school, planning and evaluation sessions during the school year, and on-the-job training in daily sessions with resource teachers. Information about the project was widely disseminated throughout the area. The effectiveness of the faculty desegregation was evaluated in a 1-day workshop; it was found that "comfortable" interracial relations had developed among the teachers on the teams. The success of team teaching as an organizational design for instruction was assessed by means of questionnaires. Copies of these questionnaires, a summary of the participants' responses during the workshop, and an outline of a plan for staff desegregation are included in an appendix. (EF)

TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT 07413

Project for the Inservice Preparation of Teachers for the Desegregation of Selected School Faculties through the Implementation of Team Teaching

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Grant Number OE-36-52-E031

April 1, 1967 through June 30, 1967

S DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
SON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
TED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
ITION OR POLICY.

ED0 24737

The following summary, because of the nature of the project and the period covered, is organized to include: (1) a narrative description of the program; (2) a report of information dissemination; and (3) evaluative reports.

I. Description of the Program

The project for staff desegregation through team teaching was organized to include three facets of inservice training: workshops for principals and teachers prior to the opening of school, planning and evaluative sessions scheduled at intervals throughout the year in each project school; and on-the-job training in daily planning sessions with resource teachers. During the period of this report, major emphases have been directed towards the on-the-job training aspect of the project and on its evaluation.

Each of the 16 project schools has developed a program distinctive to the needs of its own student body, staff, and community, and adapted to its own facilities. In most of the elementary schools the team approach has been applied with students at all levels and, to some degree, in all subjects. In secondary levels the teams have generally served only in one or two subject areas for specific levels. Teachers, working with curriculum resource teachers and program directors, have cooperatively planned and implemented the program of instruction for the large groups of students for whom they were jointly responsible.

It has been in this team planning and implementation for common educational purposes that the best growth in inter-racial attitudes has been

UD 007 413

seen. It has seemed that on teams which have most successfully developed their instructional programs, the most confortable relations and the greatest mutual respect have developed among teachers of the two races. It would be difficult to determine the precise extent to which wholesome attitudes had affected instructional success in comparison to the extent to which shared success had affected attitudes. It has seemed that the two are mutually affecting.

While the resource teachers were orginally assigned for the primary purpose of affording curriculum assistance, they have proved to be of great value as catalysts, both with regard to program development and in the area of attitude growth. Their assignment directly to the schools served has proved highly successful. At elementary level the assignment of each resource teacher to paired schools has promoted an exchange of ideas, materials, and, in some instances, of teachers for school-to-school exchange of demonstrations. Since the paired schools have opposite racial composition, this has contributed positively to the development of mutual respect among Negro and white teachers.

During the latter months of the project the development of teacher leadership in the team approach has been particularly noted. As teachers have grown more confortable with cooperative planning and flexible scheduling, they have been able to apply their respective competencies more creatively. It has seemed to those who have worked at supervisory level with the various faculties that one of the most significant features of the project has been its contribution to the professional growth of teachers, both Negro and white. Visitors to the project from other school systems have frequently commented to this point.

During the reporting period, members of the Dalewood faculty have completed their conference work with the elementary feeder schools from which

they receive students. While the original interest of these two schools was in the team teaching aspect of the project, the professional association of teachers from all white faculties with a desegregated team has seemed a positive contribution to their acceptance of the forthcoming desegregation of their own faculties.

A heavy emphasis of the project in April and May was placed on development of plans for desegregation of faculties for 1967-68. Teachers, principals, and staff members from the project schools were involved in planning and in preparatory steps. A staff desegregation committee and an inservice training committee were selected with members representing both races from all levels of the school organization. The recommendations from the Staff Desegregation Conference of February 23 (previously reported) were studied and a proposed plan of action recommended by the committee. It was from these recommendations that the proposal for an extension of the project was developed. The project schools and individual members of their faculties assisted in interpretation of the desegregation plan for 1967-68 and made valuable contributions to the acceptance of that plan through a school visitation program. Groups of teachers and principals from segregated faculties observed in the project schools and conferred with team members and principals. Teachers working in minority situations on the teams went with fellow teachers of the team majority race to lead discussions in faculty meetings at segregated schools. Included in the appendix are the materials developed for implementation of the 1967-68 school desegregation plan. The proposal for the Title IV project extension is not included, since it has already been submitted.

II. Information Dissemination

During the months of April and May, an increased number of teachers and administrators from other school districts have requested visiting

privileges to the project schools. Insofar as possible, these requests have been honored. Approximately 300 visitors from Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Florida have observed the team teaching schools during the year. Copies of the project and other printed materials related to the program have been shared with additional numbers on request.

Project directors, resource teachers, teachers, and principals have been frequent guests as speakers, panelists, and discussion leaders in faculty meetings, civic groups, student teacher seminars, and desegregation workshops.

The advisory committee, composed of project principals, non-project principals, staff members, representatives of the State Department Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, and the University Regional Consultant, have met periodically to exchange information and make recommendations.

All requests for reports, copies of the proposal, and other related materials have been honored.

Conferences have been arranged for graduate students interested in research possibilities within the project. One white principal who is engaged in doctoral studies has received University of Tennessee approval for the development of a related dissertation based on studies in the project schools. A Negro principal is proposing a master's thesis similarly based.

III. Evaluation

Since the project was related to faculty desegregation, team teaching, and teacher growth, three related means of evaluation have been employed.

<u>The effectiveness of faculty desegregation</u> was evaluated in a one-day workshop, previously described as the Staff Desegregation Conference of February 23, 1967. In this conference, three categories of participants were organized in discussion groups as follows: (1) teachers representing the minority race in each project school; (2) teachers representing the majority

race in each project school; and (3) principals of each project school. Each category of participants was then divided into groups of ten or eleven so that both races were represented in each group. One participant from each group was selected to serve as discussion leader and one as recorder. No central staff members participated in any group discussion, and recorders were asked to report only those comments or recommendations which the group wished to share.

Prior to the conference discussion guides for each category of participants were prepared as a reference for discussion leaders, and members of the central staff met with both discussion leaders and recorders to assist them in preparing for the conference. Arrangements were made for participants to leave their schools at noon in order to have the afternoon and evening sessions free from other responsibilities. The central office administrative and supervisory staff served dinner to the participants as a means of recognizing their contribution to the school system in the desegregation process. With the exception of the dinner hour and a brief orientation period at the beginning of the conference,the entire afternoon and evening sessions were devoted to small group discussions. A compilation of participants' responses is included in the appendix.

The effectiveness of team teaching as an organizational design was evaluated by means of a questionnaire, on which teachers and principals in the project schools were asked to respond on six topics related to the program: (1) inservice, (2) planning, (3) organization, (4) facilities, (5) resource teacher, and (6) general reactions. (Copies of these questionnaires are included in the appendix.)

The responses from both teachers and principals strongly favored team teaching. Among elementary teachers the strongest positive responses were shown in relation to planning and organization. Among secondary

teachers the strongest positive responses were related to planning and general reactions. Among elementary principals the largest number of positive responses were related to planning and inservice training. Secondary principals most frequently gave strong positive responses in relation to organization.

In their responses the individual questions within the various categories, elementary teachers most frequently indicated that the project had helped them: (1) provide better instructional opportunities for children of varying levels of achievement; (2) provide a variety of experiences for children of varying interests; (3) contruct special materials; (4) make use of tapes, records, projectiles, and films; and (5) investigate sources of materials and outside speakers.

Secondary teachers most consistently indicated that the team approach had helped them: (1) in working with other teachers; (2) making use of tapes, records, projectiles, and films; (3) working with other teachers in planning sessions; (4) constructing special materials; (5) locating library materials; and (6) utilizing facilities for large group instruction in a planned curriculum.

Principals of all levels most consistently responded positively to questions indicating the help of resource teachers. Elementary principals gave highest rating to their help in: (1) unit planning; (2) sharing ideas from school to school; (3) investigating sources of materials and outside speakers; (4) making use of tapes, records, projectiles, and films. There was also high consistency in indications that the project had improved the use of teacher aides. Most secondary principals responded positively concerning the resource teachers' assistance in: (1) unit planning; (2) investigating sources of materials and outside speakers; (3) constructing special materials;

(4) providing communications among faculty members; and (5) making use of tapes, records, projectiles, and films.

APPENDIX

STAFF DESEGREGATION CONFERENCE

February 23, 1967

DISCUSSION GUIDE

I. Professional Relations

- A. Teacher-Principal
- B. Teacher-Teacher
- C. Teacher-Staff
  (Principal-Staff)
- D. Teacher-Pupil
  (Principal-Pupil)
- E. Teacher-Parent
  (Principal-Parent)
- F. Teacher-Community
  (Principal-Community)
- G. School-to-School

II. Student Relations

III. Instructional Consideration

- A. Curriculum
- B. Communication
- C. Methods and Techniques
- D. Teacher Preparation and Training

IV. Administrative Consideration

- A. Organization
- B. Policy
- C. Orientation

V. Related Personal Concerns

VI. Next Steps

REACTIONS RECEIVED FROM STAFF DESEGREGATION CONFERENCE

February 23, 1967

Explanations

The following is a compilation of the reactions from the three groups of participants at the staff desegregation conference held February 23, 1967.

In compiling reactions the following procedures were used:

1. Comments follow the outline prepared for the discussion groups.

2. For each section of the outline, comments have been kept separated by principals, teachers assigned across racial lines, teachers assigned to receiving staffs.

3. Comments have been recorded in as nearly the manner in which they were presented as was possible and yet maintain some uniformity.

4. In instances in which the same or very similar comment was made by two or more discussion groups from the same category of participants, the comment was listed only once.

Reactions

I. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS

A. Teacher-Principal

1. Reaction from Principals

a. The transition to a desegregated system can enhance the quality of education in Chattanooga without sacrificing staff morale.

b. While the principal's attitude carries great weight in determining the attitude taken by school staffs and communities towards desegregation, competence of teachers of the minority race in a school is prerequisite to their acceptance by the school and community.

c. The transition to a desegregated system is smoother if minority teachers are given status, recognition, and a sense of belonging in their schools.

d. A key to successful administrator-teacher relations is fairness. Over-indulging or making excuses for a staff member of another race negates acceptance and is as demoralizing as other forms of prejudice.

e. Principals interviewing prospective teachers of another race should be honest and frank in discussing problems the teacher will face in the new teaching situation.

A. Teacher-Principal (continued)

2. Reaction from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Principals have been cooperative in the following ways:

(1) Helping teachers keep in mind that the education of the child is the most important job.

(2) Encouraging ideas

(3) Being fair

(4) Being a good listener

(5) Not being "sneaky" but "truly helpful"

(6) Being fair in expectation of extra duties

b. Principals have established proper attitudes among others:

(1) When they have enforced their original assignment of students.

(2) When they have dealt fairly with all teachers in conflict situations.

c. Principals should not be apologetic to parents and others for having a teacher assigned across racial lines.

d. Principals should think of all teachers as professional people.

e. There should be free interchange of teachers in all schools.

f. Principals need to concentrate more on informing incoming teachers of the school policies and practices so as to properly orient the new teacher, thereby helping the teacher avoid conflicting situations.

g. Principals could use the buddy system to reassure and help newcomers in the new situations.

h. Care should be taken not to confuse "new teacher problems" with racial problems.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. Principals should establish the proper professional acceptance and cooperation which the receiving teachers should extend the teachers newly assigned across racial lines.

b. Principals should provide some time in the daily or weekly schedule for teachers to engage in friendly conversation.

A. Teacher-Principal (continued)

3. c. Principals should particularly see that teachers newly assigned across racial lines understand the school regulations as they apply to all teachers to help the incoming teacher avoid misunderstanding. Situations of teachers seemingly taking advantage of regulations have resulted in some irritation.

d. Receiving teachers should work more closely with teachers newly assigned across racial lines. Team teaching is one solution to this need.

e. Principals should encourage their faculties to acquaint the teachers assigned across racial lines with the background and attitudes of the community and the students.

f. Principals should encourage receiving teachers to assist teachers newly assigned across race lines in their efforts to understand student problems, particularly helping them to distinguish between general problems and racial problems.

g. Occasional provisions should be made for informal social gatherings of teachers and principals to develop comfortable relationships.

h. Principals should provide orientation for entire faculty prior to opening of school.

B. Teacher-Teacher

1. Reactions from Principals

a. Reporting on other staff members of whatever race in a negative, critical way should be discouraged.

b. Teachers should be helped to accept constructive criticism in a mature manner, without becoming defensive.

c. Prejudice of teachers on the receiving staff can impede the effective team work of teachers of both races.

d. The rigid, prejudiced individual who resists staff desegregation is often resistant of instructional innovation or any other kind of change.

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Some resentment has been expressed by other staff members toward the team teachers.

b. Teachers of the minority group in a school would like to be thought of as "just another teacher."

B. Teacher-Teacher (continued)

2. c. Teachers assigned across race lines, but not a part of a team, have a more difficult time adjusting to the new situation.

d. When staffs are first desegregated, some teachers experience a hesitancy about discussing matters of race with teachers of a race other than their own.

e. Some Negro teachers have the feeling that white teachers discuss too freely any difficulties they have experienced teaching in desegregated situations, thereby encouraging false impressions.

f. Some white teachers assigned across racial lines expressed the feeling that they are presently assigned to the best staffs with which they have worked, emphasizing the ability of the staff members to work together.

g. Teachers generally have tried to show a friendly attitude to those of another race.

h. Occasional informal "get-togethers" among teachers have helped break the ice.

i. A sense of humor is indispensable.

j. At the outset a few Negro teachers felt that they were excluded from planning. This seemed to clear up with time.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. Communication between teachers of opposite races is a problem area.

b. Good professional relations have been established through:

(1) Sharing of experiences with students

(2) Team Teaching

(3) Assisting newcomers in the area of communications.

c. Teachers of the majority race in a school have a responsibility for helping those of the minority group adjust to the new situation and for making them feel respected and accepted.

C. Teacher-Staff (Principal-Staff)

1. Reactions from Principals

a. Teachers with personality problems making it difficult for them to relate to group work should not be assigned across race lines.

C. Teacher-Staff (Principal-Staff)(continued)

1. b. Domineering teachers should not be assigned to work on desegregated teams.

c. Teachers crossing race lines should be very competent ones, even more so than for customary placement.

d. Resource teachers occupy a position which demands competence and ethical leadership.

e. Resource teachers have been an asset.

f. Teachers prefer to know when to expect resource teachers in their classrooms.

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. Staff resource teachers have been helpful in most cases.

b. New teachers in desegregated situations need regular assurance that the administration is behind them.

D. Teacher-Pupil (Principal-Pupil)

1. Reactions from Principals

a. Some tendency for teachers to be more lenient with students of the opposite race was noted.

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Time is required for students to accept teachers of another race; but experience indicates that most of them do accept.

b. No problems were reported by one group in establishing rapport with students of the opposite race.

c. Teachers assigned across racial lines accepted students as they were.

d. Students of the opposite race have at times referred to the teachers as "that white man or woman or nigger." Teachers in the group agreed that ignoring such incidents is the best way to handle the situation, since more often than not the student has experienced a "slip of the tongue" and is embarrassed.

D. Teacher-Pupil (Principal-Pupil) (continued)

2. e. Teachers of either race assigned across racial lines may have an understandable tendency to be too lax discipline-wise. A firm but friendly control, fair treatment of all children, and an understanding of the child's background and attitude toward discipline were suggested as aids to solving this situation. It is essential that teachers recognize that family backgrounds cause some children to react with emotional disturbance in the presence of the opposite race.

f. One group agreed all teachers need to concentrate on helping children reach their potentials, forgetting race.

g. Until a teacher of the opposite race is confident of a situation, care should be exercised about touching children, especially those of junior high age or above.

h. One group expressed feeling that the ruling on corporal punishment should be reviewed and that faculty consensus should be reached and followed.

i. Early in the school year teachers and pupils should set ground rules for behavior.

j. No child should ever be singled out by race.

k. Ordinary disciplinary problems should not be mistaken for racial problems.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. One problem is a lack of understanding on the part of teachers for the cultural backgrounds of students of the opposite race.

b. Communication between white teachers and Negro students is a problem area.

c. The hold-back on discipline by minority teachers in their first cross-racial assignments is considered a foremost problem. Firmness at the outset is recommended strongly.

d. Many problems of discipline can be solved by the joint efforts of two teachers of different races.

e. Problems of discipline should be dealt with when they first arise rather than allowed to grow and affect others.

f. Members of the faculty as a whole and small related groups or teams should meet often to discuss discipline and arrive at consistent procedures.

D. Teacher-Pupil (Principal-Pupil) (continued)

3. g. Principals should counsel with minority teachers regularly.

h. Principals should be involved early in consideration of disciplinary problems.

i. Discipline problems can be rooted in the teachers' reactions at least as often as in those of students.

j. The voice tones of teachers are significant in establishing good teacher-pupil relationships.

k. Large groups of slow students or students with discipline problems should not be assigned to the teacher who is newly assigned across racial lines.

E. Teacher-Parent (Principal-Parent)

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. White parents have been found to cooperate with Negro teachers in disciplinary action.

b. White parents have generally accepted without incident the Negro teachers or guidance counselors who have made home visits.

c. Negro parents have accepted the white teachers without question and have offered their cooperation.

d. Parents should be given opportunities to express their opinions.

e. Teachers need to develop better techniques for parent conferences.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. Teachers need to involve parents of both races in school activities through:

(1) PTA Committees, not necessarily teacher led.

(2) School Projects

(3) Student programs for parents to attend

(4) Personal contacts with parents

E. Teacher-Parent (Principal-Parent) (continued)

3. a. (5) In parent conferences, teachers should avoid a "holier than thou" attitude and show interest and concern for children.

(6) In one group the greatest concern in the area of school-parent relationships was for pupil progress reports. It was recommended that different reporting methods be used in order to improve parents' understanding.

(7) Teachers should notify principals of any actions they take in regard to student discipline in order that parent questions to him can be handled without misunderstanding.

F. Teacher-Community (Principals-Community)

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. The feeling was expressed that capable Negro teachers working with previously all-white faculties have, because of their teaching excellence, been able to dispel the belief held by some that all Negro teachers are inadequately prepared.

G. School-to-School

1. Reaction from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reaction from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Teachers in desegregated faculties should express the positive side to teachers on other faculties.

b. Negative remarks from teachers in schools not desegregated can make the job harder for everybody, and they are not based on facts.

3. Reaction from Receiving Teachers

a. Principals and teachers in schools with desegregated staffs can help other schools preparing for desegregation by:

(1) Keeping their remarks concerning desegregation on a positive plane.

(2) Participating in discussions with personnel from other schools preparing for staff desegregation.

II. STUDENT RELATIONS

A. Reaction from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

B. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

1. There has been no noticeable difficulty regarding student-to-student communications.

2. Principals can avoid some trouble spots among students by refusing to be willing listeners to minor accusations.

3. Students sometimes stare at children of the opposite race when they first begin attending classes together.

4. Generally there is more name-calling within races than there is between races.

C. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

1. Teachers should plan their classroom activities carefully.

III. INSTRUCTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Curriculum

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. No problems noted.

b. A team approach at 8th grade level was recommended by one group.

c. The need for kindergarten experiences was noted.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. The curriculum should include more study on how people live together; Negro history within the context of American History; basic readers need more multi-cultural stories.

b. More multi-level materials are needed.

c. Easier loads for inexperienced teachers are recommended.

d. Adult teacher aides are needed.

B. Communication

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Teachers of both races have had some difficulty understanding and being understood by the children of the opposite race.

b. White teachers particularly found that Negro children were hesitant about expressing themselves and often would not speak loudly enough to be heard. This fact is often attributed to the poor self-image which the Negro child has.

c. Negro children working with a white teacher for the first time seemed reluctant to ask questions and needed encouragement and reassurance.

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. Receiving teachers can assist newcomers in the area of communications.

b. Consideration of children's backgrounds will allow the teacher to plan for better communications.

C. Methods and Techniques

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Many teachers feel the greatest need is for personal contact and the expression of personal concern by the teacher.

D. Teacher Preparation and Training

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

a. Preparation of teachers for a bi-racial and bi-cultural situation is needed. Last summer's workshop experience was commended.

b. Some teachers assigned across racial lines felt that much more work needs to be done with the receiving teachers to prepare them adequately and effectively to receive the teachers of the opposite race. This is also true of the classified personnel assigned to schools.

D. Teacher Preparation and Training (continued)

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

A. Organization

1. Some problems can be solved by organization; it should be recognized that not all problems involving people of different races are necessarily racial problems.

2. Lighter loads for inexperienced teachers are recommended in early months of school.

B. Policy

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

C. Orientation

1. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

2. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

3. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

a. PTA discussion groups rather than lectures, and not necessarily teacher led.

b. Parents should be informed of faculty desegregation well in advance and have opportunities to discuss this with staff members who can take a positive view.

V. RELATED PERSONAL CONCERNS

A. Reactions from Principals

(Groups did not have time to discuss this point.)

B. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

1. One group indicated no trouble experienced with associates, friends, or family because of assignment across racial lines.

2. Some teachers had experienced negative reactions from friends and relatives because of their assignments.

B. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines (continued)

3. Some teachers felt isolated and lonely at first but agreed that this was relieved after they had gotten better acquainted.

C. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

1. White teachers seem reluctant to substitute in schools with predominately Negro students.

2. Some teachers experience personal fears relative to desegregated staff assignments.

VI. NEXT STEPS

A. Reactions from Principals

1. Teachers should not be unduly pressured to go into desegregated situations.

2. The use of some instrument to measure the degree of race prejudice before assigning teachers might prove of value.

3. Principals should be asked to encourage teachers with desegregated teaching experience to assist in desegregation of other staffs.

4. Salary scales should be increased to compete with systems serving more affluent communities in order to attract more competent teachers.

5. The assignment of new teachers to schools by the Central Office staff without consent of either the teachers or the principal was proposed, but only three members of the group favored the proposal.

6. It was proposed that highly competent teachers be offered the opportunity to serve for one year on a desegregated staff with the promise of a return to the original position the following year. One principal objected to this plan.

7. Teachers assigned to a school having a preponderance of students and teachers of another race should preferably be experienced, able, and flexible.

8. Report to all principals in the school system on the results of the February 23 desegregation meeting.

9. Plan for teachers of schools in which faculties are to be desegregated to meet with teachers of other races in summer workshops, inservice training sessions, or conferences.

10. Plan to complete staff assignments early in the summer in order to allow for summer workshops with incoming staff members.

A. Reactions from Principals (continued)

11.. Provide funds to permit teachers to visit other schools in the system.

12. Pair schools on a "buddy system," so that schools with mixed staffs can help those who will be newly desegregated.

13. Team teaching has made the transition easier and more successful and should be continued.

B. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines

1. Team teaching should be used as the basis for desegregating school faculties since circumstances surrounding team teaching tend to build the confidence of a teacher assigned across racial lines and to provide a sense of security for the student. Cooperative planning was recommended for those in self-contained classrooms.

2. Advance preparation should be made for the desegregation of faculties through various media, such as:

   a. Community council or bi-racial committee

   b. Parent-Teacher Associations

   c. Central Office Administrative Staff use of commercial communications to establish public relations

   d. Bi-racial advisory board on faculty desegregation made up of teaching personnel

   e. Utilization of staff members and parents from schools with desegregated staffs to assist in preparation.

3. Personnel successfully involved in the desegregation of staff project for 1966-67 should be requested to talk with principals, teachers, and parents in schools being prepared for desegregation of staff of 1967-68.

4. Receiving teachers who have worked with teachers of the opposite race in 1966-67 should be asked to accept assignments across racial lines for 1967-68.

5. Staff desegregation should be more widely spread as quickly as possible.

6. The establishment of a "buddy-system" between schools (between new "minority" teachers and those who have experienced it) could prove beneficial to answer questions for teachers and to reassure them.

B. Reactions from Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines (continued)

7. Prospective "minority" teachers should be provided a chance to visit schools with desegregated staffs and situations similar to the ones in which they might work.

8. Assign teachers early to desegregated staffs to provide time for factual and emotional preparation.

9. Give the "minority" teacher a break student-load-wise to help in the teachers' adjustment to the new situation.

10. CEA and DCT should:

    a. Assist in development of good public relations and positive public attitudes to desegregation

    b. Afford opportunities for groups to discuss desegregation in the professional associations.

11. More than one teacher of the minority race should be assigned to a desegregated staff. At least two teachers of the same sex should also be assigned.

C. Reactions from Receiving Teachers

1. Teachers being assigned across racial lines for the first time should be prepared through group discussion and workshop experiences for the social pressures that may be exerted by neighbors, friends, and families; be oriented to the culture of the students they will teach; and be provided the chance to discuss their concerns with other teachers.

2. Principals should provide for orientation of entire faculty to desegregation prior to opening of school.

3. One group recommended the appointment of a faculty activities committee to plan opportunities for informal, tension relieving "get togethers."

4. The provision of planning time for teachers on desegregated faculties is strongly recommended.

5. Teacher personnel should be rotated within the system, giving more uniformity to the desegregation of staff and probably developing greater flexibility among teachers.

6. Means should be devised to permit Negro personnel to demonstrate capabilities to the community, thereby creating a more favorable attitude toward staff desegregation.

7. Continue team teaching in connection with staff desegregation.

C. Reactions from Receiving Teachers (continued)

8. Provide opportunities for experienced persons in staff desegregation to share experiences and evaluate techniques with prospective personnel for desegregated assignments.

9. Principals of receiving schools should feel a keen sense of responsibility to set the tone for staff behavior.

10. Some receiving teachers felt that no inexperienced teacher should be assigned across racial lines.

11. The Chattanooga Education Association should give support and leadership to the process of staff desegregation.

12. It was felt by some that evaluation meetings and/or staff desegregation conferences should not be preceded by a regular teaching day.

13. Prospective personnel for desegregated staff assignment should be provided a chance to visit schools with desegregated staffs.

14. Communities should be prepared for and should be made a part of the plans for desegregation of staffs through various media.

15. Principals with desegregated staffs should meet with principals planning for staff desegregation.

16. There should be one substitute list for all schools.

17. Teachers should be assigned to schools according to qualifications.

18. Principals should work out a "buddy system" for receiving teachers to assist incoming teachers assigned across racial lines.

19. The Central Office Staff should make more direct contact with teachers.

20. Guidance counselors are needed in elementary schools.

21. Universities and colleges should be encouraged to assign practice teachers across racial lines.

22. A salary supplement could be provided those teachers accepting assignments among the culturally deprived.

23. Continue conferences of the type held February 23, including teachers from non-desegregated staffs.

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
May 1, 1967

Staff Desegregation Report

Throughout the process of desegregation in Chattanooga Public Schools, it has been the policy to pursue a course aimed at sound educational procedure. At this time, although the Board of Education is of necessity answering charges in a lawsuit on the desegregation of schools, the same policy will be pursued. During the current school year the school system's plan for faculty desegregation has been within the requirements of the U. S. Office of Education guidelines, and it is anticipated that further requirements of the guidelines for 1967-68 will be met in the proposed plan for the extension of faculty desegregation in the city schools.

On February 23, in a meeting at Brainerd High School, teachers and principals who have been involved in faculty desegregation in 1966-67, reviewed the year's work and made recommendations for next steps in the desegregation process. In follow-up meetings of the central staff, the Board of Education, and a steering committee (see attached list), a proposed plan for desegregation for 1967-68 has been considered. In these discussions several significant considerations have emerged:

(1) The initial assignment of teachers to schools in which they are in a racial minority is an extremely difficult task--one which has proved more demanding than any other personnel problems in preparation for a school year. Teachers of both races are fearful of new, untried situations. And because of differences in racial balance and socio-economic status of school communities in the city of Chattanooga in relation to those of neighboring schools in adjacent suburban areas of the county and north Georgia systems, it has become increasingly difficult to compete for teachers. Within the city system, teachers who are already

assigned to schools in middle class suburban areas are reluctant to transfer. Teachers who are at first willing to accept assignments in desegregated faculties are later discouraged by their families and friends. The need to give additional support to teachers and to create additional appeal in staff desegregated schools for the next few years is crucial if we are to make a breakthrough in the exisiting dual structure.

(2) The need to show conspicuous improvement in our instructional programs <u>while staff desegregation is in progress</u> is equally crucial if we are to forestall further resegregation of city schools, thus compounding the problems. The community involved in desegregation of its schools needs the assurance that professional attention is being directed towards instructional improvement as well as towards racial balance in faculties and student bodies.

(3) A corps of personnel committed to school desegregation, experienced in the desegregation process and its problems, and skilled in leadership, is needed to give support and assistance to those who are newly involved.

(4) Responsibility for effective desegregation must be shared at all professional levels and in all schools within the system. Best results have been seen where principals, teachers, and supportive staffs have jointly directed their attention to the problems.

(5) Models of effective student and faculty desegregation are needed to minimize early mistakes, provide reassurance to

both professional and lay people, and to promote acceleration of the desegregation pace.

(6) Changes in the composition of student bodies in individual schools create the need for changes in curricula, school organization, and teaching techniques. Determination of such needs and the means of meeting them in individual schools requires the provision of professional planning time and inservice study at attendance level, as well as on a systemwide basis.

(7) Racially mixed student bodies particularly need racially mixed faculties and the cooperative attention of teachers of both races to designing appropriate curriculum and teaching techniques.

(8) A minimum of two teachers of the school's minority race should be assigned to newly desegregated faculties.

With these considerations in mind, the following four point plan for faculty desegregation has been developed:

(1) An attempt will be made to maintain the 41 positions now assigned across racial lines in 18 schools.

(2) Additional faculty members will be assigned across racial lines in the 18 schools when vacancies will permit. In extending desegregation of staff in these schools, special attention will be given to:

a. schools with larger number of students of a given race and few teachers of that race.

b. schools having only one teacher of the opposite race assigned to their faculties.

The first consideration is prompted by the fact that students of both races deserve the comfort of having on the faculty some teachers of their own race with whom to identify. The second consideration is prompted by the fact that one teacher of the opposite race on a staff can hardly accomplish educationally for children what desegregation of staff is intended to accomplish. Also, it is felt by many teachers who have been involved in the staff desegregation process in Chattanooga and elsewhere that an unsatisfactory situation is created for the teacher assigned as the only staff member of the opposite race.

(3) Vacancies occurring in schools other than the 17 schools presently desegregated will be filled with teachers of the opposite race whenever suitable applicants will permit.

This step in desegregation of staff is being considered for two reasons primarily:

a. Such a plan will extend desegregation to more schools in the system and will make all schools subject to staff desegregation. It is felt by staff members working with faculties and by many faculty members who participated in the staff desegregation conference held February 23 at Brainerd High School that it is no longer necessary or wise to confine staff desegregation to selected schools. This position is further strengthened by the fact that all schools are open to student desegregation.

b. Following this procedure for 1967-68 staffing will be a step in the direction of filling all vacancies on the

basis of the applicant's outstanding ability to fill the position for which employed without regard to race.

(4) Experienced teachers on existing faculties will then be asked to exchange positions for one year (1967-68) with teachers on another faculty of a different race by a pairing of schools of predominantly opposite races. A minimum of two teachers of the school minority race will be the aim per unit in such an exchange. During the trial year, workshop and inservice training assistance will be provided for participating teachers. At the end of one year trial exchange, those involved will have the option of: (1) returning to their original schools, which will then have established desegregated faculties; (2) remaining on the desegregated faculty to which they were assigned for the project year; or (3) requesting transfer to another desegregated faculty according to the established procedures for transfer.

Application has been made under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act for extension of the team teaching project with additional provisions for stipend paid workshop time for all teachers in the system who will be newly assigned across racial lines.

Responsibility for encouraging experienced teachers to engage themselves in the proposed exchange will rest with principals of the paired schools. Difficult though it will be to consider giving up a good teacher for even a year, the importance to the entire school system of this issue warrants the most positive leadership on the part of each principal. Every effort should be made to interpret to teachers the crucial nature of the problem and to solicit their cooperation.

In their meeting on April 28, members of the steering committee suggested several kinds of activities which principals might find helpful in this process. These are to be considered options from which principals may wish to choose according

to their knowledge of what will prove most effective for their own faculties:

(1) Before presenting the matter to teachers, principals may wish to meet with Mr. Lynn Canady for a review of what has been done in the team teaching schools this year and go with him in small groups to observe in some of the schools whose faculties are already desegregated.

(2) Members of the administrative and supervisory staff who have worked closely with desegregated faculties may be asked to share in faculty meeting discussions of the proposal.

(3) Teachers of both races who have had a year of experience in faculty desegregation may be asked to share in faculty meeting discussions. Many of these teachers have very positive views as a result of their experience, and they have volunteered to assist as needed.

In addition to these possibilities a letter will be sent to each teacher to encourage their positive acceptance of the proposed plan.

Every effort will be made to assist and support the individual faculties involved in this process of change. All professional personnel in the school system share a team responsibility for effecting a smooth transition from the dual system to a unified approach whereby the best possible educational programs may be afforded to all students for whom we are jointly responsible.

May 3, 1967

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mrs. Looney

FROM: Mrs. Nardo

SUBJECT: Report of Desegregation Committee Meeting, May 2, 1967

In the May 2 meeting of the Staff Desegregation Committee the following suggestions were made for various aspects of the 1967-68 program:

Interpretation to Principals

(1) Dr. Martin should give the initial interpretation in principals' meeting on Friday, May 5.

(2) In that meeting attention should be called to the action of the Board of Education on April 12, with regard to faculty desegregation.

Inservice Training

(1) A recommendation should be made to the Inservice Training Committee concerning the need for sub-professional and classified personnel to be involved in inservice considerations directed towards establishment of effective racial relations in their roles in the schools (see attached memorandum).

(2) The tendency of teachers newly assigned across racial lines to create problems by avoiding firm classroom control and disciplinary measures with pupils of the opposite race should be brought to the attention of principals and teachers for consideration in inservice programs.

Teacher Exchange

(1) In schools whose faculties have already been desegregated, teachers of the school's minority race can be of assistance to principals in interpreting to other teachers and encouraging their participation in the exchange program.

(2) Special education teachers should be included for consideration in the school-to-school exchange of teachers.

(3) The secondary reading laboratory teachers should be considered in the exchange program, since the likeness of laboratory programs, equipment, and services will minimize the adjustments required.

Teacher Exchange (continued)

(4) Consideration should be given to possible position exchanges of such itinerant personnel as speech and hearing teachers, librarians, and elementary reading and mathematics resource teachers; but these exchanges should not be included in the designated number of teachers to be exchanged between paired schools.

(5) Every effort should be made to work out exchanges of teachers with like competencies, but without damaging existing educational programs.

In addition to the suggestions listed above, the committee members recognized a need among teachers, particularly those in new and difficult assignments, to air their feelings occasionally without concern for recriminatory reactions. While it was not felt that structured provisions for such counseling are appropriate at this time, it was the general feeling that principals, staff members, and members of the committee should be alerted to this need and prepared to afford a supportive relationship for teachers during the period of transition, dealing discreetly with confidential expressions of their natural tensions and concerns.

NLN:wl

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Procedure Sheet for
Orienting Personnel to the Staff Desegregation
Plan and for Implementing Step Four of the Plan

1. May 5, 1967 - Principals Meeting to discuss 1967 staff desegregation and the four point plan to be followed.

2. May 8, 1967 - Principals will distribute to employees copies of the Superintendent's letter and will discuss with the staff the desegregation plan for 1967-68 as it relates to their particular schools.

   Use whatever materials furnished in this packet that is felt advisable to aid in the discussion.

3. May 8, 1967 - After discussion of the plan is held with the school faculty, the principal should distribute the memorandum from the Superintendent containing the assignment questionnaire.

4. May 10, 1967 - The principal should collect from each staff member the assignment questionnaire distributed May 8.

5. May 11-23, 1967 - The principal should make and execute plans for teams of teachers to visit with his staff and for members of his staff to visit schools of predominately the opposite race. Arrangements are to be made with Mr. Robert Canady and should be made as soon as possible to assure proper use of the short period of time allotted for this activity.

   Discussions should be held with teachers interested in or showing any inclination to accept assignment across racial lines.

   Principals of paired schools should continue their discussion of possible exchange assignments. Meetings of teachers interested in exchanging should be arranged with the principal of the receiving school and perhaps a few faculty members.

6. May 25, 1967 - Principals from paired schools are to send their report on the prepared form showing teacher exchanges for 1967-68 to the Division of General Administration by May 25, 1967. Reports will be accepted earlier if ready.

7. May 29-June 5 1967 - For further communication with schools and faculties should the time be needed.

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 8, 1967

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Professional Staff Personnel

FROM: Charles E. Martin, Superintendent CEM

SUBJECT: Staff Desegregation Plans for 1967-68

The purpose of this memorandum is to bring to the professional staff personnel of Chattanooga Public Schools information concerning staff desegregation plans for 1967-68, by which time staff desegregation is to be effected well beyond its present extent. The system now has 41 teachers assigned across racial lines in 18 schools.

Every member of the professional staff of Chattanooga Schools owes a debt of gratitude to these 41 teachers who accepted their responsibility as teachers of all children. In so doing, they helped initiate sound educational staffing for our schools and have made a lasting contribution to their profession and to the school system.

As we move forward with staff desegregation in 1967-68, it is important that each professional staff member be prepared to accept his or her share of responsibility for the movement. When the time comes for experienced teachers to lend strength to the staff desegregation movement by transferring to other schools, it is important that teachers be able to look upon themselves as professionally responsible for the education of all children. This is to say that as educators we are dedicated to the educational process, not just to providing education for the children who happen to attend a certain school.

Many people have been involved over the past several months in the formulation of a plan to extend staff desegregation for the 1967-68 term. In February all teachers assigned across racial lines for 1966-67 and selected teachers from the majority race of each desegregated staff met in conference at Brainerd High School. Drawing upon information obtained from the conference and other sources, Central Office staff members prepared a tentative plan for extending desegregation in the 1967-68 term. The tentative plan was presented to the Board of Education; to all school principals; and to a staff desegregation committee comprised of central staff members, principals, and teachers.

Each of the three groups studied the tentative plan in order to make suggestions for changes and implementations. From the work and consideration of the groups mentioned, the following four-point plan has been devised to extend staff desegregation in Chattanooga schools for 1967-68.

1. The 41 positions presently established in the 18 schools with desegregated staffs are to be maintained during 1967-68.

2. Additional staff members will be assigned across racial lines in the 18 schools with desegregated staffs by filling vacancies whenever qualified applicants are available.

3. Vacancies occurring in schools other than the 18 schools with desegregated staffs will be filled with teachers of the opposite race whenever qualified applicants are available.

4. An exchange of experienced teachers from schools of predominantly opposite races will be accomplished by pairing schools and extending transfer privileges for the 1968-69 school term. This plan will permit the teachers who exchange assignments for the 1967-68 year the opportunity to choose one of three assignments for 1968-69:

   a. Return to the position they held in the 1966-67 term; this privilege will be assured.

   b. Request to remain in the school to which assigned during 1967-68 term; this request will be honored whenever possible.

   c. Request transfer to some other staff through regular transfer channels; this request will be honored whenever possible.

A brief explanation should be given for each of the four parts of the plan in order that each professional staff member will be aware of the thinking which has gone into the formulation of the plan.

1. Maintaining the 41 positions seems a logical thing to do, especially since most of the teachers involved are in team teaching assignments that the system expects to continue for 1967-68.

2. Placing additional staff members assigned across racial lines in the 18 staff desegregated schools seems appropriate since these staffs have already been desegregated successfully. In extending desegregation of the staff in the 18 schools, special attention will be given

   a. To schools with large numbers of students of a given race and few teachers of that race. This consideration is prompted by the fact that students of both races deserve the comfort of having some teachers of their own race with whom to identify.

   b. To schools having only one teacher of the opposite race assigned to their faculties. This consideration is prompted by the fact

that one teacher of the opposite race can hardly accomplish educationally for children what desegregation of staff is intended to accomplish. Also it is felt by many teachers who have been involved in the staff desegregation process in Chattanooga and elsewhere that an unsatisfactory situation is created for the teacher assigned as the only staff member of the opposite race.

3. Filling vacancies in schools other than the 18 with desegregated staffs is planned for two reasons:

   a. Such a plan will extend staff desegregation to more schools in the system and make all schools subject to staff desegregation. It is felt by central staff members working with faculties and by many faculty members who participated in the staff desegregation conference held February 23 at Brainerd High School that it is no longer necessary or wise to confine staff desegregation to selected schools. This consideration is further strengthened by the fact that all schools are open to student desegregation.

   b. Following this procedure for filling vacancies for 1967-68 will be moving the Chattanooga system near the time when vacancies will be filled on the basis of the applicant's outstanding ability to fill the position for which employed without regard to race.

4. The exchange of experienced teachers between paired schools for one year is to be effected for two reasons

   a. It will provide some balance between the number of experienced and inexperienced teachers participating in the desegregation of staff movement and will allow experienced teachers a chance to assume their professional responsibility.

   b. Teachers who participate in this phase of staff desegregation will be included in a special inservice workshop under federal grant. It is felt that the educational program for Chattanooga Schools will be strengthened by teachers who participated in the workshop.

I have requested your principal to hold discussions with you concerning this memorandum and to begin to work out details of the teacher exchange. Your acceptance of this responsibility will reflect credit upon you and the Chattanooga Public Schools. It will also negate the necessity for the arbitrary assignment of professional personnel across racial lines.

CEM/sh

PROPOSED EXCHANGE OF TEACHERS IN HIGH SCHOOLS
FOR 1967-68 SCHOOL YEAR

Minority Teachers Presently Assigned	School	Involved in Exchange	School	Minority Teachers Presently Assigned
0	Brainerd High	1		
		1		
			1 Howard High	1
			1	
			1	
0	Chatta. High	1		
		1		
			1	
			1 Riverside High	2
			1	
		1		
0	Kirkman Tech	1		
0	TOTALS	6	6	3

PROPOSED EXCHANGE OF TEACHERS IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS
FOR 1967-68 SCHOOL YEAR

Minority Teachers Presently Assigned	School	Teachers to be Involved in Exchange		School	Minority Teachers Presently Assigned
2	Dalewood Jr.	- vacancies			
3	East Side Jr.	- vacancies			
4	Hardy Jr.	- vacancies			
0	Brainerd Jr.	2	2	Howard Jr.	2
0	E.Lake Jr.	2	2	Alton Park Jr.	0
0	Lookout Jr.	2	2		
0	Elbert Long	2	2	Orchard Knob Jr.	3
0	N. Chatta.	2	2	Riverside Jr.	2
9	TOTALS	10	10		7

PROPOSED EXCHANGE OF TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS FOR 1967-68 SCHOOL YEAR

Minority Teachers Presently Assigned	School	Teachers to be Involved in Exchanged		School	Minority Teachers Presently Assigned
6	Avondale	- vacancies			
3	Ridgedale	- vacancies			
1	Barger	1	1	Joseph E. Smith	0
0	Sunnyside	2	2		
0	G.R.Brown	2	2	James A. Henry	0
1	Cedar Hill	1	1	Howard Elem.	0
0	Hemlock	2	2		
0	Highland P.	2	2		
0	Clifton Hills	2	2	Piney Woods	2
0	E. Chatta.	2	2	Orchard Knob Elem.	4
0	Eastdale	2	2		
0	E.Lake Elem.	2	2	Calvin Donaldson	0
0	St. Elmo	2	2		
0	Garber	2	2	E. Fifth St.	1
0	Normal Park	2	2		
0	E.Long Elem.	2	2	Charles A.Bell	0
0	M. Ridge	2	2		
1	Oak Grove	1	1	Louie Sanderson	1
0	Woodmore	2	2	Trotter	2
0	Glenwood	2	2	Davenport	0
12	TOTALS	33	33		10

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Chattanooga, Tennessee

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Professional Staff Teaching Personnel

FROM: Charles E. Martin, Superintendent CEM

SUBJECT: Staff Desegregation Assignment Questionnaire

To provide principals with information concerning teacher preferences in the desegregation of staff assignments for 1967-68, each teacher in the system is requested to complete this questionnaire and return it to the principal by May 10, 1967.

I. The staff desegregation committee and others have recommended certain ideas that faculties may wish to use in preparing for the acceptance of teachers of the opposite race and in preparing for some members of the faculty to accept assignments for 1967-68 in schools of predominantly the opposite race.

Your reaction to these questions will help your principal to make the necessary plans.

___ ___ 1. Do you wish to have a small team of teachers who have worked on desegregated staffs during the 1966-67 term to come to your school for a meeting with your faculty.
yes no

___ ___ 2. Do you wish to send a group from your school to visit a school of predominantly the opposite race?
yes no

___ ___ 3. Do you wish to have only your principal visit a school of predominantly the opposite race?
yes no

___ ___ 4. Would you like to visit a school of predominantly the opposite race?
yes no

II. Your principal has discussed with you the pairing of schools for an exchange of teachers for the 1967-68 term.

yes no Do you wish to discuss with your principal the opportunity to accept this professional challenge?

III. Please list three other schools of predominantly the opposite race in which you would prefer to work in the event assignment is necessary.

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

_____
Teacher's Signature

_____
School

_____
Present Assignment

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Report of Principals from Paired Schools
for Staff Exchange

I. Exchange of Personnel

The following personnel from the schools listed have agreed to an exchange of assignments for the 1967-68 school term with the assurance that they may return to their present assignment in 1968-69 if they wish.

INSTRUCTIONS:
Indicate below the name of each school the teachers from that school who will exchange assignments with teachers from the other school. List the teachers exchanging positions opposite each other. Indicate the grades or subject areas involved in the exchange under the teachers' names.

_____	_____
Teachers	Teachers
1. _____	1. _____
_____	_____
2. _____	2. _____
_____	_____

II. Additional Personnel Interested in Exchange Assignments

1. _____	1. _____
_____	_____
2. _____	2. _____
_____	_____
3. _____	3. _____
_____	_____

Chattanooga Public Schools

Chattanooga, Tennessee

LIST OF SCHOOLS IN THE TEAM TEACHING PROJECT -

Schools	Number of Teachers Assigned Across Racial Lines
Howard High School	1
Riverside High School	2
Dalewood Jr. High School	2
East Side Jr. High School	3
Hardy Jr. High School	4
Howard Jr. High School	2
Orchard Knob Jr. High School	3
Riverside Jr. High School	2
Avondale	6
Henry L. Barger	1
Cedar Hill	1
Louie Sanderson	1
Orchard Knob Elementary	4
Piney Woods	2
Ridgedale	3
Frank H. Trotter	2

PROPOSED INSERVICE SCHEDULE

1967-68

August 7-11
(30 hours)
(3 weeks before school opens)

Principals' Workshop

Purpose: To plan Course #3, the systemwide professional inservice to be conducted in individual schools

August 21-25
(30 hours)
(week before school opens)

Course #1 - Team Teaching and Staff Desegregation (15 Schools) (Stipend)

Participants:

Selected returning minority members of teams
Selected returning majority members of teams
New minority members of teams
New majority members of teams
Principals of the 15 schools
(Do not receive stipend)

August 21-25
(30 hours)

Course #2 - Staff Desegregation (Stipend)

Participants:

From team teaching schools (non-team members)
Returning minority members of staff

From non-team teaching schools
Returning minority members of staff
New minority members of staff

August 31
September 1, 22
12 hours additional
(30 hours)

Course #3 - Professional Inservice

Participants:

All teachers and principals at individual schools

During School Year
(30 hours)

Course #4 - Team Teaching and Staff Desegregation (Stipend)

Participants:

Same as for Course #1; principals receive stipend for this course

TEAM TEACHING PROJECT
1966-67

Principal Questionnaire

Elementary 8 Secondary 8

Instructions: Please read the entire questionnaire before checking the appropriate blank.

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
I.	Inservice				
	As a result of preschool inservice workshops I feel that I was prepared				
	A. to meet some of the organizational challenges in changing from an isolated classroom to team teaching where other teachers are involved.	E - 6 S - 4	0 3	0 0	0 0
	B. to meet some of the problems in inter-personal relationships in changing from an isolated classroom to team teaching	E - 6 S - 4	0 3	0 0	0 0
	C. to understand and implement various multi-grouping patterns such as:				
	1. large group instruction (LGI)	E - 5 S - 3	1 3	0 1	0 0
	2. small group discussions (SGD)	E - 5 S - 3	1 3	0 1	0 0
	3. independent study (IS)	E - 4 S - 2	2 4	0 1	0 0
	4. supplementary instruction (SI)	E - 5 S - 2	1 4	0 1	0 0
	D. to implement multi-materials (such as self-instruction, programmed, labs, etc.) in addition to basic textbook series in my instructional program.	E - 4 S - 1	2 5	0 1	0 0

COMMENTS:

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
II.	Planning				
	As a result of my experience in team teaching this year, I feel that				
A.	Teachers do a greater amount of planning than previously noted.	E - 6 S - 3	1 4	0 1	0 0
B.	the planning sessions have helped teachers to grow in greater understanding of curriculum.	E - 6 S - 4	1 3	0 0	0 1
C.	the planning time with other teachers has improved the quality of teaching.	E - 4 S - 3	3 4	0 0	0 1
D.	I have been involved in planning more with team teachers than with other teachers.	E - 5 S - 1	1 4	0 3	0 0

COMMENTS:

III.	Organization of Team Teaching				
	In my opinion, the organizational structure of team teaching has helped				
A.	to provide better instructional opportunities for children of varying levels of achievement.	E - 2 S - 4	0 3	0 1	0 0
B.	to provide a variety of experiences for children of varying interests.	E - 5 S - 2	2 5	0 1	0 0
C.	to facilitate more efficient use of the school building.	E - 3 S - 4	3 2	0 2	0 0
D.	to utilize more frequently the use of the large group or small group areas in the school.	E - 5 S - 4	2 2	0 2	0 0

	Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
III. (continued)				
E. to facilitate the use of the following resources outside the classroom:				
library	E - 4 S - 6	3 1	0 1	0 0
itinerant teachers	E - 4 S - 3	3 3	0 2	0 0
guidance personnel	E - 1 S - 4	3 2	2 2	0 0
consultants	E - 5 S - 3	2 3	0 2	0 0
community resource people	E - 2 S - 3	5 4	0 0	0 0
other (please list)				
_____				
_____				
_____				

COMMENTS:

IV. Facilities

I have been able

A. to provide facilities for LGI when needed in the planned curriculum program.	E - 4 S - 5	2 3	1 0	0 0
B. to provide facilities for SGI when needed in the planned curriculum program.	E - 3 S - 3	4 4	0 1	0 0

COMMENTS:

V. Resource Teacher

In reflecting on the role of the resource teacher, which of the following tasks do you feel provide the most assistance from the resource teacher:

		Most Valuable	Least Valuable	No Opinion
1. A.	to contact resource persons for units of study.	E - 5 S - 5	2 1	0 0
B.	to provide communications among faculty members.	E - 4 S - 6	2 2	1 0
C.	to share ideas from other schools in planning sessions.	E - 6 S - 3	1 5	0 0
D.	to exchange materials regularly between other schools.	E - 5 S - 2	1 3	0 3
E.	to help in unit planning.	E - 7 S - 7	0 1	0 0
F.	to investigate sources of materials or outside speakers.	E - 6 S - 7	1 0	0 0
G.	to help locate library materials.	E - 4 S - 4	3 1	0 2
H.	to make use of tapes, records, projectuals, and films.	E - 6 S - 6	1 0	0 1
I.	to construct special materials and devices for use in the work.	E - 5 S - 6	2 0	0 1
J.	scheduling the activities for a team.	E - 2 S - 7	3 1	0 0
K.	others:			
	_____			
	_____			
	_____			

2. What do you see as the three main jobs of a resource teacher?

COMMENTS:

VI. In reflecting on this year's team teaching experience, please respond to the following challenges by checking under

__+__, if you feel positive about the area listed,

__0__, if the area has not been a problem for you, and

__-__, if you feel the area needs attention.

		+	0	-
1.	Involving teachers in planning sessions	E - 5	0	2
		S - 4	1	1
2.	Involving teachers in implementing plans	E - 6	1	0
		S - 4	1	2
3.	Compromising in planning sessions	E - 2	3	2
		S - 1	3	2
4.	Sharing materials	E - 5	1	1
		S - 5	2	0
5.	Sharing teaching stations	E - 5	1	1
		S - 3	2	2
6.	Working with a resource teacher	E - 4	0	2
		S - 4	1	2
7.	Working with central office supervisory staff	E - 5	2	0
		S - 3	3	1
8.	Working with itinerant teachers, if applicable	E - 3	1	2
		S - 1	2	1
9.	Working with the librarian	E - 3	2	2
		S - 1	4	2
10.	Working with teacher aides	E - 6	1	0
		S - 2	4	1
11.	Involving guidance personnel	E - 1	0	4
		S - 3	2	1
12.	Adjusting to various size groups of students	E - 2	4	1
		S - 3	1	3
13.	Assuming a leadership role with teachers	E - 4	2	1
		S - 2	3	2
14.	Helping teachers use test data	E - 2	2	3
		S - 2	1	4
15.	Evaluating student progress in a team teaching program	E - 3	2	2
		S - 3	0	4
16.	Learning to use new materials (such as labs or LSI booklets)	E - 3	3	1
		S - 3	0	4
17.	Learning to use new teaching machines (such as tape recorder, overhead projector, etc.)	E - 3	2	2
		S - 3	2	2
18.	Learning to use teaching aids (such as transparencies)	E - 1	3	3
		S - 3	1	3

COMMENTS:

TEAM TEACHING PROJECT
1966-67

Teacher Questionnaire

Elementary 89 Secondary 38

Instructions: Please read the entire questionnaire before checking the appropriate blanks.

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
I.	Inservice				
	As a result of preschool inservice workshops (Summer, 1966) I feel that I was able to develop sufficient initial understanding of team teaching:				
A.	to meet some of the organizational challenges (such as sharing teaching stations) in changing from an isolated classroom to team teaching where other teachers are involved.	E - 41 S - 20	22 11	5 0	4 4
B.	to meet some of the problems in inter-personal relationships in changing from an isolated classroom to team teaching.	E - 44 S - 17	29 12	6 0	4 3
C.	to implement various multi-grouping patterns such as:				
	1. large group instruction (LGI)	E - 46 S - 21	16 10	4 0	6 3
	2. small group discussions (SGD)	E - 34 S - 14	24 15	4 1	5 3
	3. independent study (IS)	E - 32 S - 17	25 11	7 2	4 3
	4. supplementary instruction (SI)	E - 31 S - 20	28 10	5 0	4 3
D.	to implement multi-materials (such as self-instruction, programmed, labs, etc.) in addition to basic textbook series in my instructional program.	E - 36 S - 13	25 17	3 2	3 2

COMMENTS:

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
II. Planning					
As a result of my experience in team teaching this year, I feel that:					
A. I have done a greater amount of planning than I would have done if I had not been a member of a team.	E - 51	19	12	3
	S - 18	13	5	1
B. the planning sessions have helped me to grow in my understanding of curriculum.	E - 58	17	11	0
	S - 27	8	2	0
C. the planning time with other teachers has improved the learning environment for children.	E - 58	19	3	6
	S - 24	14	0	0

COMMENTS:

III. Organization of Team Teaching					
In my opinion, the organizational structure of team teaching has helped:					
A. to provide better instructional opportunities for children of varying levels of achievement.	E - 75	13	5	2
	S - 26	12	0	0
B. to provide a variety of experiences for children of varying interests.	E - 67	21	5	2
	S - 25	13	0	0
C. to facilitate more efficient use of the school building.	E - 41	33	6	5
	S - 20	14	1	3
D. to utilize more frequently the use of large group or small group areas in the school.	E - 46	30	6	4
	S - 24	13	1	0

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
III. Organization of Team Teaching (continued)					
E. to facilitate the use of the following resources outside the classroom:					
library	E	66	13	4	3
	S	29	9	0	0
itinerant teachers	E	55	16	8	2
	S	5	16	13	3
guidance personnel	E	25	25	16	7
	S	24	8	6	0
consultants	E	45	23	8	5
	S	21	16	2	0
community resource people	E	42	24	11	2
	S	6	5	4	1
others (please list)					
Student teachers		13	14	1	1
Aides					
Visiting teachers					
Audio-Visual Aids					

COMMENTS:

IV. Facilities

Because of team teaching, I have been able

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
A. to utilize facilities for LGI when needed in the planned curriculum program.	E	54	19	9	5
	S	32	4	1	0
B. utilize facilities for SGI when needed in the planned curriculum program.	E	39	35	6	5
	S	16	15	5	1
C. to make good use of the teachers' workroom.	E	26	28	19	7
	S	20	11	4	2

		Yes	To Some Extent	No	No Opinion
IV. Facilities (continued)					
D. to perceive effective use of a resource center.	E -	46	32	4	3
	S -	17	20	1	0

COMMENTS:

Lack of classroom space.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

		Most Valuable	Least Valuable	No Opinion
V. Resource Teacher				
In reflecting on the role of the resource teacher, which of the following tasks do you feel provide the most assistance from the resource teacher.				
1. A. to contact resource persons for units of study.	E -	57	6	15
	S -	25	2	7
B. to provide communications among faculty members.	E -	32	24	15
	S -	23	3	10
C. to share ideas from other schools in planning sessions.	E -	65	2	12
	S -	29	5	4
D. to exchange materials regularly between other schools.	E -	53	8	11
	S -	16	9	11
E. to help in unit planning.	E -	63	7	10
	S -	27	7	4
F. to investigate sources of materials or outside speakers.	E -	71	2	6
	S -	23	2	3
G. to help locate library materials.	E -	65	7	7
	S -	31	1	6
H. to make use of tapes, records, projectuals, and films.	E -	67	6	6
	S -	34	1	3
I. to construct special materials and devices for use in the work.	E -	70	4	6
	S -	32	3	3

	Most Valuable	Least Valuable	No Opinion
V. Resource Teacher (continued			
1. J. scheduling the activities for a team.	E - 33 S - 27	23 5	18 6
K. others:			
Helping in S.G.I.			
Helping with L.G.I.			

2. What do you see as the three main jobs of a resource teacher?
   Collecting materials for units.
   Helping to present units of study.
   Demonstrating various teaching techniques.

COMMENTS:

VI. In reflecting on this year's team teaching experience, please indicate your reaction to the comments listed below by checking under the appropriate column as the following code suggests:

__+__, if you feel positive about the area listed,

__0__, if the area has not been a problem for you, and

__-__, if you feel the area needs attention.

	+	0	-
1. Working with other teachers in planning sessions	E - 59 S - 32	23 5	14 1
2. Working with other teachers in implementing plans	E - 47 S - 35	35 8	11 0
3. Working with a resource teacher	E - 49 S - 26	33 21	9 3
4. Working with central office supervisory staff	E - 32 S - 19	48 11	8 9
5. Working with the administrator	E - 45 S - 24	37 10	8 3
6. Working with the librarian	E - 41 S - 22	34 15	17 1

VI. (continued)

		+	0	-
7.	Working with the teacher aide	E - 50 S - 15	30 6	9 17
8.	Working with guidance personnel	E - 28 S - 23	29 7	20 7
9	Compromising in planning sessions	E - 37 S - 25	37 12	11 1
10.	Sharing materials	E - 49 S - 26	32 10	7 1
11.	Sharing teaching stations	E - 41 S - 24	32 11	12 1
12.	Adjusting to various size groups of students	E - 42 S - 21	36 12	7 5
13.	Assuming a leadership role with other teachers	E - 39 S - 24	45 14	7 0
14.	Assuming a "follower" role with other teachers	E - 36 S - 25	34 11	6 1
15.	Evaluating student progress in a team teaching program	E - 35 S - 18	33 9	14 11
16.	Learining to use new materials (such as labs or LSI booklets)	E - 32 S - 20	35 11	18 7
17.	Learning to use new teaching machines (such as tape recorder, overhead projector, etc.)	E - 35 S - 24	36 10	16 4
18.	Learning to use teaching aids (such as transparencies)	E - 22 S - 23	38 10	26 5

COMMENTS: